

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the present application as evidenced by the Office Action of February 9, 2006 (hereinafter "Office Action"). In response, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 12, and 24 to clarify that the first recipient related information is date information associated with the recipient. Dependent Claims 2, 3, 13, and 14 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the recitations of the pending independent claims. Favorable reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested for at least the reasons discussed hereafter.

Independent Claims 1, 12, and 24 are Patentable

Independent Claims 1, 12, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No.6,044,275 to Boltz et al. (hereinafter "Boltz") in view of U. S. patent No. 6,625,460 to Patil (hereinafter "Patil"). As discussed above, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 12 to incorporate the recitations of dependent Claims 2 and 13 so as to clarify that the first recipient related information is date information associated with the recipient. Independent Claim 24 has been amended similarly to independent Claims 1 and 12.

Independent Claim 1 as amended recites, in part:

retrieving date information from an electronic date determination unit;
retrieving first recipient related information from an electronic contact register, the first recipient related information being date information associated with the recipient; and
automatically sending a pre-configured electronic message over a network to the recipient based on the date information and the first recipient related information. (Emphasis added).

Independent Claims 12 and 24 include similar recitations. As highlighted above, some embodiments of the present invention may allow more simplified sending of personal messages, such as birthday greetings, to specific recipients. By retrieving date information

associated with a recipient from an electronic contact register, a message may be differentiated so that the recipient may feel that he/she is getting special attention, while limiting the effort that a sender puts in to create such a message.

The Office Action acknowledges that Bolt does not disclose or suggest "retrieving first recipient related information from an electronic contact register and sending the messaged based on data information and recipient information." (Office Action, page 2). The Office Action maintains, however, that Patil provides the missing teachings, including the first recipient information being date information associated with the recipient. (Office Action, page 3).

Applicants respectfully submit that Patil does not disclose or suggest retrieving date information associated with a recipient from an electronic contact register and automatically sending a pre-configured electronic message over a network to the recipient based at least in part on the date information associated with the recipient. Instead, Patil describes sending a message addressed to recipients that are identified on a distribution list. In more detail, Patil describes using a short message (SM) program to create a distribution list of recipients, which is sent as a message to a message server 40. (Patil, col. 4, lines 38 - 55).

When a user of the phone wants to send a message he/she accesses the SM program and selects an option for sending messages. (Patil, col. 4, lines 63 - 65). A message is then composed (Patil, col. 4, line 65 - col. 5, line 11), a distribution list is selected (Patil, col. 5, lines 11 - 13), and the message is sent to the message server 40. (Patil, col. 5, lines 13 - 15). The message server 40 sends the message to the recipients identified by the distribution list. (Patil, col. 7, lines 53 - 64). Sending of messages can be based on triggering conditions, such as time of day, elapsed time, a certain price for a commodity, a particular weather condition, etc. (Patil, col. 5, lines 15 - 31). Applicants submit, however, that nowhere does Patil appear to disclose or suggest that the triggering condition is based on date information associated with a recipient.

In re: Wong et al.
Application Serial No.: 10/519,278
Filing Date: December 22, 2004
Page 9


Because Patil describes sending a message to several recipients identified in a distribution list, it is not based at least in part on date information associated with a single recipient. For example, if the teachings of Patil were to be applied to a birthday message (the birthday being the date information associated with a single recipient), then several recipients on a distribution list would receive the same birthday message on the same day, which is clearly not desirable.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 12, and 24 are patentable over the cited references and that Claims 4 - 11 and 15 - 23.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the above-entitled application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (919) 854-1400.

Respectfully submitted,



D. Scott Moore
Registration No. 42,011

USPTO Customer No. 20792
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec
Post Office Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: 919/854-1400
Facsimile: 919/854-1401

Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 9, 2006.



Traci A. Brown